



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

John Brown's raid Prof. Burgess has this to say: "Nothing could have been more untoward, wickedly harmful, and positively diabolical. . . . If the whole thing, both as to time, methods, and results, had been planned by his Satanic Majesty himself, it could not have succeeded better in setting the sound conservative movements of the age at naught and in creating a state of feeling which offered the most capital opportunities for the triumph of political insincerity, radicalism, and rascality over their opposites."

Our author's descriptions of the presidential election of 1860, the drift toward secession, and the capture of Fort Sumter are truly graphic; but when he essays the difficult tasks of picturing Pope's campaign in Northeastern Virginia, Bragg's invasion of Kentucky, and the battles of Antietam, Fredericksburg, and Gettysburg, he grows exceedingly tiresome, not for the want of material, which he has in abundance, but simply for the reason that he is not a military writer. In his description of the international complications during the closing years of the war Prof. Burgess gets back to safer ground. Nothing in his work is clearer, for example, than his account of the diplomatic victories of Mr. Seward. He is to be congratulated, moreover, on the absence of that sectional rancor and American bombast which too frequently beset many of our latter-day historians. On the whole, the work before us is better adapted to the wants of the general reader than to those of the teacher, but the period is well covered and the student will find it both interesting and stimulating.

B. J. R.

---

#### THE LESSONS OF RECONSTRUCTION.

RECONSTRUCTION AND THE CONSTITUTION, 1866-1876. By John W. Burgess, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law and Dean of the Faculty of Political Science in Columbia University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. \$1.

The very scholarly study of "Reconstruction," in which Prof. Burgess continues his volumes on the Civil War and the period immediately preceding it in the American History Series, is doubly timely in view of present and prospective

colonial problems, and of the recrudescence of agitation of reapportionment of representation, through a bill designed to affect only States with a large or predominant negro population. The decade covered by this study is, from every point of view, a dark one in our political history. It was a period of intense partisanship, of bitter mutual recrimination, and, though the wounds are healed, the scars remain. I would not revive old controversy, still less take part in it; but all readers should be glad to know the lessons that this distinguished student of our history has drawn from the facts that he has so fully and carefully presented, and what follows is an aim to present some of these conclusions as nearly as may be in his own words.

The reestablishment of a real national brotherhood between North and South demands not only the recognition that Secession was an error as well as a failure, but that Reconstruction was an error as well as a failure, an error hardly less gross, a failure hardly less disastrous. The North was sincere, its purpose praiseworthy, its method a blunder criminal in its consequences. The issue between Lincoln and Johnson on the one hand and Congress on the other was, in essence, whether the States by secession had lost their statehood. Legally and logically Congress was right as against the Presidents, in making of reconstruction a new creation of statehood, but erred in the application of its one principle. The Freedmen's Bureau was so administered as to do the race for whose benefit it was intended almost as much harm as good. The State legislation undertaken under Johnson's tentative reconstruction was not unnatural nor unreasonable, nor even unwise. It was a mere abstract assumption to say that the negro ought, at the moment of his emancipation, to have had equal civil rights, for civilized man can be safely trusted with a much larger liberty than the barbarian or the semibarbarian. But if legislation grew more drastic and the demands of Congress on the applicants for Statehood more oppressive, it is just to recognize that this was due to a natural though unjustified distrust of Johnson, and to the tactlessness of the South in attempting to send to Congress par-

ticularly obnoxious men and to pass laws that seemed dangerously restrictive of the civil liberties of the negro.

Victory rested with the fanaticism of extreme partisanship. The contest with the President blinded the perceptions of Congressmen as to the morality, legality, and propriety of the means they were willing to employ. They committed a great political error, if not a sin, in the creation of a dominant, ignorant electorate, establishing barbarism in power over civilization. Neither the welfare of the whole land nor of any part of it should have been promoted by the subjection of the white race to the black in politics and government. It was a great wrong to the negroes themselves; but the passions of the men of that day had become so inflamed and so completely dominating that they obscured reason, drowned the voice of prudence, and even dulled the sense of decency. Congress had the constitutional power, but it used it recklessly and often exceeded it. Anybody of common sense and common honesty could, at the time, have foreseen some of the horrible results which were sure to follow. Johnson foresaw them, but even when he spoke most cogently and convincingly, he spoke to deaf ears. It was self-stultification for Congress to claim that the Johnson State governments were unrepresentative on account of their restriction of franchise, and then to create new State governments upon the basis of a minority of duly qualified and registered voters. This terrible inconsistency was a high political crime; the attempt to impeach the President was a great political scandal; Stanton's gathering of armed men, to sustain him in the war office after his dismissal, was treason. Johnson was violent, obstinate, coarse, vindictive; but he was patriotic and loyal, and the sequel has proved that he was nearer right than Congress in his conception of what measures were for the welfare of the country. The way in which Congress prevented any decision on the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts in the *McCordle* case was an abominable subterfuge and a shameful abuse of its powers. The Republican party had abandoned Johnson, not he the party. Few men have been so unreasonably slandered and vilified.

The position taken by Grant toward the Tenure of Office Act was a complete vindication of Johnson and in no small degree of his deeds. The imposition of universal negro suffrage upon the Southern community was one of the "blunder crimes" of the century, and the governments that resulted from it were so tyrannic, corrupt, mean, and vulgar as to repel the historian. It was the most soul-sickening spectacle that Americans had ever been called upon to behold, and the acts by which it was upheld were often unconstitutional. Even the North was surfeited with Reconstruction Republican administrations, though not ready for a Democratic one. It wanted sound money, devotion to the economic interests of the whole people, and a chance for the South to work out its own salvation. That was what it got in the administration of Hayes, whose title to the Presidency was morally and legally unsound and impeachable, if the law of suffrage as then existing be accepted as the basis of reasoning.

As a result of the withdrawal of the troops order and peace were quickly established, the plundered and impoverished South took hope; but it was a "Solid South," and no wonder. Life, property, happiness, honor, civilization—everything which makes existence endurable—demanded that the decent white men of the South should stand shoulder to shoulder in defending their families, their homes, and their communities from any return of the vile plague under which they had suffered so long and so cruelly. Slavery was a great wrong, Secession was an error and a terrible blunder, but Reconstruction was a punishment so far in excess of the crime that it extinguished every sense of culpability. Until four years ago there was little progress in reconciliation; and if a great change has since been wrought, it is due to the fact that the Republican party, in its work of imposing the sovereignty of the United States upon eight millions of Asiatics, has changed its views in regard to the political relation of races and has at last virtually accepted the ideas of the South upon that subject.

Such are the judgments, expressed in large part in his very words, of the Dean of the Faculty of Political Science in Co-

lumbia University. His conclusion is to be found in his preface: "It is the white man's mission, his duty, and his right, to hold the reins of political power in his own hands for the civilization of the world and the welfare of mankind."

BENJAMIN W. WELLS.

---

CANON MOBERLY ON ATONEMENT AND PERSONALITY.

ATONEMENT AND PERSONALITY. By Canon Moberly. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$3.

No English theologian of the present time has attained so rapidly an authoritative and respected position as Canon Moberly. When we remember the brilliancy and the originality of his associates at the University of Oxford, it is no small achievement that he has already made for himself a name which to Anglicans everywhere stands alongside of Gore, Illingworth, and Aubrey Moore. His recent work on "Atonement and Personality" is only a further proof of his remarkable ability as a speculative thinker. Hardly any other subject has so profoundly excited the interest of mediæval and modern Christian thought. Certainly no subject has produced more widespread, practical effects on Christian conduct and teaching. In fact, crass ideas of the atonement have evoked in the minds of hosts of Christians a conception of the Deity which has brought about results hardly less disastrous than those which Plato traced in Greek society to the influence of the Homeric poems. The dogmatic significance of the death of Jesus Christ has indeed to be restated, the juristic elements inherited from St. Anselm's formula must be eliminated. The problem is not so clear as it was once, but the answer is bound to be more satisfactory to the Christian conscience. It is characteristic of Canon Moberly's method that he does not try to reach this final expression. But his discussion points to its general terms. We know at any rate how it must be expressed. The key is to be found in human personality. Analyze that, and the problem of sin in human nature and exactly what